

Canadian NATO
Parliamentary Association



Association parlementaire
canadienne de l'OTAN

**Report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation
respecting its participation at the Visit of the Defence
and Security Committee**

Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association (NATO PA)

Washington, D.C. and Florida, U.S.A.

January 25-29, 2010

Report

The Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association has the honour to present its report on the meetings of the Defence and Security Committee held in Washington, D.C. and Florida, United States, January 25-29, 2010. Canada was represented by Senator Joseph A. Day, Mrs. Cheryl Gallant, M.P. and Mr. Claude Bachand, M.P.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At a time of complex challenges in the international security system, the Obama administration places a high value on its alliances and partnerships, none more so than the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), according to senior administration officials. The Administration plans to work closely with its NATO partners on issues from ongoing efforts in Afghanistan, to relations with Russia, to countering the missile threat from the Middle East.

This was the principal message that the NATO Parliamentary Assembly's Defence and Security Committee brought back from its annual visit to the United States in January of 2010. The delegation was composed of 40 members of parliament from some 20 NATO member states and led by Committee Chairman Julio Miranda Calha (Portugal) and accompanied by NATO Parliamentary Assembly President John Tanner (USA).

The delegation visited Washington for meetings with senior Obama administration officials, including General James Jones, National Security Advisor to the President, and Ellen Tauscher, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security; as well as other officials from the State and Defence Departments, and independent experts from the Center for American Progress, the German Marshall Fund, and the Center for Non-proliferation Studies.

In addition, the delegation engaged in an extensive discussion about the Alliance's future with NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Transformation General Stéphane Abrial. Challenges in the Afghanistan/Pakistan region and the broader Middle East were the principal subjects of the delegation's meeting with General David Petraeus, Combatant Commander of Central Command, as well as with Admiral Eric Olson, Commander of Special Operations Command.

In the Committee's annual visit to U.S. military facilities, the delegation was welcomed at Central Command as well as at Hurlburt Field, where Lt. General Donny Wurster briefed the delegation on the Field's missions, with a strong focus on the Air Force Special Operations Command. The delegation also received briefings on the 33rd Fighter Wing and its role in standing up a training centre for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.

THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF NATO

The Committee's visit began with an extensive discussion about the Alliance's future with NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT) General Stéphane Abrial. General Abrial, of the French Air Force, is the first non-American to hold this command, which is co-located with US Joint Forces Command in Norfolk, Virginia; he is

thus the only NATO Commander on American soil. The General characterized his role as helping NATO's shareholders, the nations, develop the forces that will be the most relevant in facing the challenges of tomorrow and the day after.

ACT's most pressing priority, according to the General, is supporting the next phases and innovations in current operations – from training to lessons learned, from developing counterinsurgency analysis to fielding technology to neutralize threats posed by improvised explosive devices. However, ACT also conducts longer-term projects on horizons as distant as 2030 and beyond, to feed into processes like the development of a new Strategic Concept for NATO.

The General underlined the theme of collective defence as the core of NATO, but suggested that precisely because the deterrence generated by NATO's Article 5 posture is effective in most areas, attacks will focus on perceived alliance vulnerabilities and aim to undermine its cohesiveness, and suggested that as a consequence, the traditional understanding of an Article 5 attack needs rethinking. He rejected a distinction between capabilities used to defend Alliance territory, and those necessary for out-of-area projection, given the increased physical surface of NATO brought about by enlargement and the capabilities needed to project forces from one nation of the Alliance to defend another, thousands of kilometres away.

Looking forward, the General suggested that 'hybrid threats,' featuring simultaneous use of weapons of mass destruction, conventional warfare, irregular warfare, terrorism, as well as a host of other criminal or disruptive activities, were the way of the future for those who wish to do the Alliance harm. Responding to such a threat requires a full spectrum of capabilities, according to the General, because an adaptable adversary will seek the gaps in our defence and exploit them.

General Abrial recommended matching NATO's stated ambitions with its means, and making the most of defence investments by building on capabilities that already exist, rather than seeking an unlikely growth in forces. This would be achieved through making the most of innovation and technology, including by working consistently with industry to ensure mutual knowledge of what innovation can offer, at what price and in what time frame.

General Abrial pointed to several specific steps ACT was taking to ensure the Alliance's ongoing transformation, including improving ACT's coordination with all national transformational organizations including the U.S. Joint Forces Command; publishing a catalogue of available and verified doctrine and training resources; establishing ACT as NATO's main think tank on military matters; and making Alliance partnerships truly operational, including those with the European Union and the UN.

General James Jones, National Security Adviser to President Obama, agreed that this is a pivotal strategic moment for NATO. The organization must 'change its anchor points' and move from a reactive to a proactive posture in order to remain relevant to the challenges of the 21st century. In order to achieve the most effective multilateral responses to these challenges, President Obama spends a great deal of time and effort engaging in and enhancing transatlantic dialogue and partnership building, according to Jones.

Jones praised the ongoing process to develop a new Strategic Concept for NATO and suggested parliamentarians should take note of and emphasize the far-reaching nature of this exercise. Specific issues such as common funding, the role and nature of the NATO Response Force, the process of enlargement, and decision-making procedures would all need to be addressed in the discussion.

Proclaiming Europe's 'front and centre' position in the administration's agenda in dealing with international challenges, Julianne Smith, Principal Director (Europe and NATO) in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defence for Policy, laid out US priorities for the new NATO strategic concept, including: brevity (to ensure its utility as a public diplomacy document); a reassurance that NATO will continue to serve its core collective defence purpose as well as crisis management functions; a continuing transition to a *security* alliance able to play a supporting role in addressing challenges such as cyber security and high north management; the need to weave civilian and military efforts together in operations; the growing importance of partnerships and the need to streamline them; creativity in addressing capability gaps; and reforming NATO, including its forces, command structures, and decision-making procedures.

AFGHANISTAN

In 2010, ISAF Commander Stanley McChrystal will have the forces he needs to conduct a winning counter-insurgency campaign in Afghanistan, according to General David Petraeus, Commander of Central Command (CENTCOM). In remarks to the delegation at Central Command in Tampa, Petraeus addressed the evolution of the ISAF mission, stating that General Stanley McChrystal for the first time had the structure and people in place to succeed, something his predecessors did not. For the first time, the inputs to the mission were appropriate to the challenges it faced. He also praised the integration of training efforts under the NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan, comparing it favourably to his experience in Iraq. Even so, Petraeus predicted that the conflict would get harder before it got easier, with an increased level of violence to be expected in 2010. High-profile attacks in Kabul, while attention-grabbing, were not the true measure of the course of the conflict, and in any case were at a relatively low level. General Petraeus also commended the counter-insurgency operations conducted by Pakistan in the last 10 months, calling them a hugely important development.

Craig Mullaney, Principal Director in the Office of the Secretary of Defence for Afghanistan, Pakistan and Central Asia, echoed the sentiment that ISAF had the forces in place for success; however, the chief concern remained ensuring that Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) were provided with enough trainers to enable them to defeat the Taliban.

Citing recent approval to raise the numbers of the Afghan National Army (ANA) to 270,000 by October 2011, Mullaney was encouraged by the record number of recruits – some 9,000 in December alone – to the Army. He credited this largely to the significant pay increase provided to soldiers, for the first time an equivalent or better rate than paid by the Taliban. However, the higher number of recruits demanded a commensurate increased need for trainers, and to date a shortage of some 1,500 trainers remained.

The main lines of operation now included concentrating on accelerated growth of the ANSF, according to Mullaney, and ensuring they would be effective and sustainable in

the long run. The mission could best be described now as 'clear, hold, build, and transition.' Afghans would have to be assured of the enduring commitment of its international partners, and that we will not walk away when the military mission ends. But at the same time they must be made to understand that the combat commitment is not open-ended, and would begin to be scaled back in the summer of 2011. The Alliance must also remain clear about the fact that that it is not necessary, nor feasible, to create a modern western state in Afghanistan in order to achieve our goals, Mullaney stated, citing U.S. Defence Secretary Gates.

While suggesting that NATO's commitment had been re-established to the mission, General Jones told the delegation that continued progress would require firm resolve, and in particular addressing the critical shortage of trainers for the ANSF. He praised the appointment of a newly empowered NATO Senior Civilian Representative in Kabul, as well as recent collaboration in sending strong and effective messages to Afghan President Karzai regarding the appropriateness of cabinet appointees. Jones also underlined the need for all NATO countries to stress to Pakistani authorities the need to continue efforts to address the 'cancer' of extremism throughout the region.

Margaret McKean, from the Office of the Special Representative for Afghanistan and Pakistan at the Department of State, suggested 2010 was the year of implementation of the Obama administration's approach in Afghanistan, after a 'holding pattern' period caused by the presidential elections in Kabul. McKean suggested the U.S. was placing a renewed emphasis on several areas, including agriculture as a driver for employment; the need for a continued increase in deployed civilian experts; a broader focus beyond Kabul; and a determined effort against corruption. Regarding Pakistan, priorities included the negotiation of a transit agreement to allow Afghan goods to reach Indian markets, and a communications strategy to combat extremist propaganda in the media and improve the Pakistani public's perception of the west.

US DEFENCE POLICY

At the time of the delegation's visit, the U.S. government was finalizing a number of strategic reviews, including a Quadrennial Defence Review (QDR), a Nuclear Posture Review, as well as reviews on ballistic missile defence and cyber security. Julianne Smith of the Defence Department confirmed that the North Atlantic Council would be briefed on the QDR, and suggested Allies would be particularly interested in strong emphases on alliances and partnerships, as well as the appearance for the first time of a section on climate and security.

Lawrence Korb of the Center for American Progress offered a candid, independent evaluation of the current state of the U.S. armed forces. Korb reminded the delegation that the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan were the first significant conflicts the U.S. has engaged in without a draft and without an increase in taxes; indeed, the U.S. has cut taxes and amassed a huge budget deficit.

Korb explained that U.S. officials had decided some time ago to retain a relatively small active duty ground force, backed by national guard and reserve personnel that would be called up for a short time in case of war; should a war prove lengthy, a draft would be instituted. The logic of this policy – the institution of a draft – has not been followed, causing damage to the armed forces through over-deployment, lowered standards for

recruitment, increased use of private contractors, and record levels of injuries (both physical and mental). Coupled with poor management under the previous administration and ballooning weapons systems costs, the armed forces are in a state of crisis. Korb predicted that for political reasons, defence spending would continue to rise under the Obama administration rather than being pared and re-directed to other priorities.

ARMS CONTROL, NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND MISSILE DEFENCE

Ellen Tauscher, Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, a distinguished former member of the Assembly, briefed members on a broad range of subjects in her portfolio. Suggesting that President Obama was 'animated' by his vision of a world free of nuclear weapons (which would be underlined in the Nuclear Posture Review's call for reduced reliance on nuclear weapons to defend the U.S.), Tauscher suggested that confidence building with Russia, including successful conclusion of a follow-on treaty to START, was crucial to the administration's efforts. Even as the administration pursued a 'global zero' goal through advancing efforts on legal regimes dealing with nuclear testing and fissile materials, the administration retained a responsibility for its citizens' protection and would therefore invest judiciously to ensure that whatever U.S. stockpile remained was reliable. Tauscher pointed to a need to strengthen the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Summit meeting on nuclear security issues called by President Obama as other noteworthy steps the administration is taking.

In this context, independent expert Miles Pomper of the James Martin Center for Non-proliferation Studies presented the case for reducing and regulating tactical (non-strategic) nuclear weapons in Europe to the delegation. Pomper suggested that approximately 200 such weapons continue to be stored in five European NATO states, including Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, and Turkey. Pomper suggested that these weapons were intended to counter massive tank formations, which no longer threaten NATO today. He argued that the distance of the weapons from NATO's enlarged borders reduces their military utility and that in most cases other nuclear assets can serve the extended deterrence mission.

Under Secretary Tauscher told the delegation that the United States would not act unilaterally or precipitously on the issue of extended deterrence. She reminded members that the U.S. extends its deterrence to some 30 countries, including in Asia, a consideration that the administration had to weigh carefully. Tauscher emphasized that the U.S. would use ongoing discussions in the context of a new Strategic Concept for NATO to gauge Allies on their views on the U.S. extended deterrence policies, and pledged close consultation in capitals with governments and parliaments on the issue.

Tauscher suggested, however, that the U.S. nuclear arsenal had little deterrence value against non-state terrorist groups 'with no return address,' and that continued work on missile defences could play a role in addressing this threat.

Tauscher also reviewed the Obama Administration's missile defence plans, which had changed in response to 1) a slowing development of Iranian long-range missiles but a tripling of their short and medium-range missiles and 2) a desire to maintain the indivisibility of NATO's security.

The U.S.'s new 'Phased Adaptive Approach' to missile defence is predicated on flexible deployments of assets in phases, in order to be able to adapt to a changing threat, according to Dr. John Plumb, Principal Deputy, Nuclear and Missile Defence Policy at the Department of Defence. Noting that the U.S. was about to release a Ballistic Missile Defence Review, he suggested that the new plan outlined in the new administration policy was more flexible and more adapted to a shorter-range threat, which has been judged as the more immediate missile threat to Alliance territory. Dr. Plumb laid out the four phases, which would first seek to protect Alliance territory as well as deployed U.S. forces, and culminate in the 2020 timeframe with more advanced interceptor technology deployed to address threats to the United States and Canada.

Plumb emphasized that the new approach was intended as a U.S. contribution to a NATO missile defence system (as an 'essential' element of Article 5). The U.S. hoped other countries would 'plug in' their own defensive capabilities to the command and control system NATO had already approved (known as ALT-BMD), which would allow the various systems to be interoperable, according to Plumb. Regarding Russian reaction to the new approach, Plumb assured the delegation that this issue had been kept separate from the negotiations on a new START nuclear arms treaty, and that the U.S. continued to assure Russian officials that these capabilities were intended to counter rogue state threats and would have no impact on Russia's deterrent.

HIGH NORTH

Daniel P. Fata, Vice-President of the Cohen Group and Transatlantic Fellow at the German Marshall Fund, briefed members on Arctic Security issues. Given the increasing strategic importance of this part of the world, its greater accessibility because of climate change, and the increased attention it has consequently received in academic and policy circles, Fata suggested that it was not yet clear whether cooperation or competition would be the dominant dynamic in the years to come. Pointing to increased maritime traffic, fishing, and submarine activity, as well as the high likelihood of significant natural resource deposits, Fata suggested that this 'stew of activity' called for proactive engagement to avoid both potential geo-political tensions as well as environmental disasters. Fata suggested that this issue presented an excellent opportunity to engage Russia fully in information sharing and joint operations. Asked about a potential NATO role, Fata suggested joint work in the context of the NATO-Russia Council on assessing risks, as well as cooperation on networking and information sharing to achieve a common picture of activity in the Arctic as well as coordination on disaster response.

The Defence Department's Julianne Smith admitted that Arctic security concerns could not be a highest priority agenda item for the U.S. administration given other challenges. Regarding a potential NATO role, she referenced the Alliance's limited capabilities in this area, particularly of high-value assets in the Arctic such as ice breakers and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance assets. She agreed that NATO likely had a supporting role to play in supporting crisis response or management, but that other organizations with more direct mandates to address the Arctic – such as the Arctic Council – may be well served by enhancing their own capabilities in these respects.

MILITARY SITE VISITS

In accordance with its practice of visiting military facilities outside of Washington, the Committee visited Hurlburt Field, Headquarters of Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC) under the command of Lt Gen Donny Wurster. AFSOC fills a number of missions that are increasingly in demand in the current security environment. Personnel from Hurlburt was serving in Afghanistan and running air traffic control in Haiti at the time of the delegation's visit.

General Wurster explained that the failed Operation Eagle Claw to rescue hostages held in Iran was a seminal moment for U.S. Special Operations forces; governmental leaders realized that a constantly maintained capability was needed for such operations. While U.S. Special Forces (SOF) had evolved into a highly capable tool, the delegation was told that many of its assets date from the Vietnam era and needed to be re-capitalized. General Wurster explained that most nations cannot afford airpower to move their SOF in difficult conditions, even though that's what makes them most relevant.

The delegation also heard a briefing on the stand-up of a training centre for the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF or F-35); observed training by the Special Tactics Training Squadron; and inspected a CV-22 Osprey aircraft, and an AC-130 gunship.

In Tampa, the delegation also had the opportunity to meet with Admiral Eric Olson, Commander of Special Operations Command (SOCOM), who argued that the undeniable growth of special operations forces (SOF) is a needed response to address 21st century security challenges. SOF is critical to projecting power and alleviating the causes of extremism, according to Olson, who lauded efforts by Allies to train and operate together, especially since 9/11/2001. While conceding that nations had different conceptions of SOF, Olson nevertheless praised the NATO Special Operations Coordination Center (NSCC), in particular its role in the exchange of knowledge and experience. He further commended NATO for agreeing to the elevation of the NSCC to a NATO SOF headquarters headed by a three-star officer. He underlined the need to continue joint exercises in the NATO context, which demonstrate a resolve to work together as a coherent Allied force. This will be particularly important given that most conflicts involving NATO in the future will require broadly capable and skilled SOF, according to Olson.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. Leon Benoit, M.P.
Chair
Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association (NATO PA)

Travel Costs

ASSOCIATION	Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association (NATO PA)
ACTIVITY	Visit of the Defence and Security Committee
DESTINATION	Washington, D.C. and Florida, U.S.A.
DATES	January 25-29, 2010
DELEGATION	
SENATE	Senator Joseph A. Day
HOUSE OF COMMONS	Mrs. Cheryl Gallant, M.P. and Mr. Claude Bachand, M.P.
STAFF	
TRANSPORTATION	\$7,915.20
ACCOMMODATION	\$3,801.42
HOSPITALITY	\$0.00
PER DIEMS	\$1,490.75
OFFICIAL GIFTS	\$0.00
MISCELLANEOUS / REGISTRATION FEES	\$0.00
TOTAL	\$13,207.37